

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
WAYCROSS DIVISION**

CHEIRON NATHANIEL HAMMOND,

Plaintiff,

v.

OFFICER CHANEY; and COFFEE
CORRECTIONAL FACILITY, in their
individual and official capacities,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO.: 5:22-cv-8

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Plaintiff filed this action, asserting claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Docs. 1. This matter is before the Court for a frivolity screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. For the reasons stated below, I **RECOMMEND** the Court **DISMISS** Plaintiff's against Defendant Coffee Correctional Facility. However, I **FIND** Plaintiff's First Amendment mail claim may proceed against Defendant Chaney.

PLAINTIFF'S CLAIMS¹

Plaintiff brings this suit under § 1983, alleging violations of his First Amendment constitutional rights while at Coffee Correctional Facility ("CCF"). Doc. 1. Plaintiff alleges Defendant Chaney, a correctional officer at CCF, interfered and tampered with his legal and personal mail. Id. at 3. Plaintiff explains Defendant Chaney confiscated his legal mail purportedly to test it for contraband, but never actually inspected the mail, and instead

¹ All allegations set forth here are taken from Plaintiff's Complaint. Doc. 1. During frivolity review under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, "[t]he complaint's factual allegations must be accepted as true." Waldman v. Conway, 871 F.3d 1283, 1289 (11th Cir. 2017).

intentionally misplaced both his legal and personal mail. Id. at 4. Plaintiff was forced to sign for his mail, even though he was never given the mail, and Defendant Chaney confiscated the mail. Id. at 7. Plaintiff's mail contained time-sensitive correspondence from his attorney that was never delivered to him. Id. Plaintiff seeks monetary damages as a result. Id. at 5–6.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

A federal court is required to conduct an initial screening of all complaints filed by prisoners and plaintiffs proceeding *in forma pauperis*. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915A(a), 1915(a). During the initial screening, the court must identify any cognizable claims in the complaint. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b). Additionally, the court must dismiss the complaint (or any portion of the complaint) that is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or which seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. Id. The pleadings of unrepresented parties are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys and, therefore, must be liberally construed. Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). However, Plaintiff's unrepresented status will not excuse mistakes regarding procedural rules. McNeil v. United States, 508 U.S. 106, 113 (1993).

A claim is frivolous under § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) if it is “without arguable merit either in law or fact.” Moore v. Bargstedt, 203 F. App'x 321, 323 (11th Cir. 2006) (quoting Bilal v. Driver, 251 F.3d 1346, 1349 (11th Cir. 2001)). In order to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, a complaint must contain “sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). To state a claim, a complaint must contain “more than labels and conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not” suffice. Twombly, 550 U.S. at 555.

DISCUSSION

Plaintiff is suing CCF (or CoreCivic) as a Defendant. Doc. 1. In order to state a claim for relief under § 1983, a plaintiff must allege “a person acting under color of state law” committed the act or omission in dispute. Hale v. Tallapoosa County, 50 F.3d 1579, 1582 (11th Cir. 1995). While local governments qualify as “persons” under § 1983, state agencies, penal institutions, and private corporations which contract with states to operate penal institutions are generally not considered legal entities subject to suit. Thomas v. Illinois, 697 F.3d 612, 613 (7th Cir. 2012) (holding the Eleventh Amendment bars § 1983 suits against state agencies) (citing Will v. Mich. Dep’t of State Police, 491 U.S. 58, 66–70 (1989)); Dean v. Barber, 951 F.2d 1210, 1214 (11th Cir. 1992) (“Sheriff’s departments and police departments are not usually considered legal entities subject to suit . . .”) (citations omitted); Lawal v. Fowler, 196 F. App’x 765, 768 (11th Cir. 2006) (analyzing Georgia law and concluding the same); Williams v. Chatham Cnty. Sherriff’s Complex, Case No. 4:07-cv-68, 2007 WL 2345243 (S.D. Ga. August 14, 2007) (“The county jail, however, has no independent legal identity and therefore is not an entity that is subject to suit under Section 1983.”) (citations omitted). Because CCF is a penal institution, it is not a “person” subject to suit under § 1983. Hale, 50 F.3d at 1582. Accordingly, I **RECOMMEND** the Court **DISMISS** Plaintiff’s claim against CCF.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above I **RECOMMEND** the Court **DISMISS** Plaintiff’s claims against Defendant Coffee Correctional Facility. However, I **FIND** Plaintiff’s First Amendment mail claim may proceed against Defendant Chaney.

Any objections to this Report and Recommendation shall be filed within 14 days of today’s date. Objections shall be specific and in writing. Any objection the Magistrate Judge

failed to address a contention raised in the Amended Complaint or an argument raised in a filing must be included. Failure to file timely, written objections will bar any later challenge or review of the Magistrate Judge's factual findings and legal conclusions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); Harrigan v. Metro Dade Police Dep't Station #4, 977 F.3d 1185, 1192–93 (11th Cir. 2020). To be clear, a party waives all rights to challenge the Magistrate Judge's factual findings and legal conclusions on appeal by failing to file timely, written objections. Harrigan, 977 F.3d at 1192–93; 11th Cir. R. 3-1. A copy of the objections must be served upon all other parties to the action.

Upon receipt of Objections meeting the specificity requirement set out above, a United States District Judge will make a de novo determination of those portions of the report, proposed findings, or recommendation to which objection is made and may accept, reject, or modify in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. Objections not meeting the specificity requirement set out above will not be considered by a District Judge. A party may not appeal a Magistrate Judge's report and recommendation directly to the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit. Appeals may be made only from a final judgment entered by or at the direction of a District Judge.

SO REPORTED and RECOMMENDED, this 11th day of May, 2022.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'B. Cheesbro', is written over a horizontal line.

BENJAMIN W. CHEESBRO
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA